

Secure quantum string seal exists

Guang Ping He

*Department of Physics and Advanced Research Center,
Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275, China*

It was claimed that all quantum string seals are insecure [H. F. Chau, quant-ph/0602099]. However, here it will be shown that for imperfect quantum string seals, the information obtained by the measurement proposed in that reference is trivial. Therefore imperfect quantum string seals can be unconditionally secure.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd, 03.67.Hk, 03.67.Mn, 89.70.+c

The idea of quantum seal was first proposed by Bechmann-Pasquinucci [1], who also found that secure perfect quantum seal is impossible [2]. Soon it was found by He [3] that security bounds also exist for imperfect quantum bit seal. He proposed an explicit cheating strategy with which the reader can decode the sealed message with exactly the same reliability as that of the honest measurement, while the cheating can escape from being detected with a probability which cannot be made arbitrarily small. Shortly after that, Chau studied a less general model of imperfect quantum bit seal (which is a special case of He's model where $\{g \notin G_0 \cup G_1\} = \emptyset$ and α is known to Bob), and proposed a measurement strategy which will cause less detectable disturbance to the seal if the reader sacrifices the reliability of the message he decoded [4].

At the same time, an imperfect quantum string seal scheme was proposed [5]. Though the security of each single bit in the sealed string is still restricted by the security bounds of imperfect quantum bit seal [3, 4], the whole string can be secure in the sense that decoding much of the bits will result in a non-trivial probability of being detected. But recently, it was claimed that all quantum string seals are insecure [6]. The claim was based on a measurement strategy which is said to be able to obtain non-trivial information on the sealed message, and escape verifier's detection at least half of the time. However, it will be proven below that for imperfect quantum string seals, the information obtained by this measurement is trivial. Therefore the security of imperfect quantum string seal [5] can not be denied.

According to Ref. [6], the measurement strategy it proposed can enable Bob to distinguish the sealed message with the probability $p < p_{\max}$. Here $p_{\max}$ is a parameter determined by the quantum string seal scheme chosen by Alice. But we must notice an important difference between imperfect quantum bit seal and string seal. That is, $p_{\max}$ needs not to have a large value in the latter. The readability requirement of imperfect quantum string seal is merely to enable Bob to obtain a string b' , which matches the original n -bit string b sealed by Alice except with a small error rate ε (i.e. the Hamming distance between b and b' is not greater than εn). In other words, each bit of b' can be different from the corresponding bit of b with the probability ε . Note that this

requirement never implies that the probability for b' to be exactly equal to b (i.e. the probability $p_{\max}$) needs to be $(1 - \varepsilon)$. In fact, even for a very small ε , the number of possible b' can be numerous. Meanwhile, the probability $p_{\max}$ for $b' = b$ to occur is extremely small. Taking the scheme proposed in Ref. [5] for example, the error rate is $\varepsilon \equiv \sin^2(\Theta/n^\alpha)$, where Θ ($0 < \Theta \ll \pi/4$) and α ($0 < \alpha < 1/2$) are fixed constants. We can see that the readability of the sealed string can be very high since $(1 - \varepsilon)$ can be made arbitrarily close to 1 by increasing n . On the other hand, the order of magnitude of $p_{\max}$ is $(1 - \varepsilon)^n \sim (1 - \Theta^2/n^{2\alpha})^n$, which can be made arbitrarily small as n increases.

So we can see that with the measurement strategy proposed in Ref. [6], the probability p for Bob to distinguish faultlessly the original sealed string b is very small. Therefore the most important parameter characterizing the amount of information obtained by the measurement strategy is not the probability p . Instead, it is the reliability of Bob's output string b' in the rest $(1 - p)$ cases, i.e., how much information of b is reflected by b' . Here we give a brief evaluation with a simple string seal scheme. Suppose that the sealed state for the message i' is

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{i'}\rangle = \sum_{j'} \lambda_{i'j'} |\psi_{j'}\rangle_B. \quad (1)$$

The expression of the proposed measurement in Ref. [6] (see Eq. (18) of that reference) can be rewritten as

$$M_i = (a + b) |i\rangle \langle i| + a \sum_{j \neq i} |j\rangle \langle j|. \quad (2)$$

Applying this measurement on the sealed state, we have

$$M_i |\tilde{\psi}_{i'}\rangle = (a + b) \lambda_{i'i} |i\rangle + a \sum_{j \neq i} \lambda_{i'j} |j\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Thus the probability for the message i' to be decoded as i is

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i'i} &= a^2 + (2ab + b^2) \lambda_{i'i}^2 \\ &= \frac{1 - \nu}{N} + \nu \lambda_{i'i}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Taking $\nu = 1/2$, as suggested by Ref. [6], it gives

$$p_{i'i} = \frac{1}{2N} + \frac{\lambda_{i'i}^2}{2}. \quad (5)$$

This equation means that any one of the N possible messages has at least the probability $1/(2N)$ to be decoded as message i , even if its content has nothing to do with i at all. In other words, whenever Bob obtains a message via the measurement strategy, there is a probability $N \cdot 1/(2N) = 1/2$ that the original message can be anything, i.e., the amount of information he obtained is zero. Hence we can see that what was obtained in Ref. [6] is simply a natural result – Bob obtains useful information only with less than $1/2$ chance, therefore the disturbance on the sealed state is also less than half. This is consistent with the security proof of the quantum string seal [5], that reading less bits of the string will stand less chances to be detected. It does not mean that unconditionally secure imperfect quantum string seal is impossible. Instead, it provides a clear example of how

the quantum string seal remains secure against coherent measurements.

At last, I would like to provide a simple measurement strategy which is as efficient as the one proposed in Ref. [6], while no quantum computer is needed. Bob can simply toss a coin to decide his action. At half of the cases he performs the honest measurement (which generally requires individual measurement only) and reads the string, while at the other half of the cases he does nothing. Clearly he can obtain the sealed message with the probability $1/2$, while at the other half of the time the sealed state remains perfectly intact so he will not be detected.

This work was supported in part by the Foundation of Zhongshan University Advanced Research Center.

-
- [1] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, *Int. J. Quant. Inform.* **1** (2003) 217.
 - [2] H. Bechmann-Pasquinucci, G. M. D'Ariano, C. Macchiavello, *Int. J. Quant. Inform.* **3** (2005) 435.
 - [3] G. P. He, quant-ph/0502179; *Phys. Rev.* **A71** (2005) 054304.
 - [4] H. F. Chau, Insecurity of imperfect quantum bit seal, quant-ph/0503031 (to appear in *Phys. Lett. A*).
 - [5] G. P. He, Quantum bit string sealing, quant-ph/0502091 v3.
 - [6] H. F. Chau, Quantum string seal is insecure, quant-ph/0602099 v1.